

REMARKS

The Official Action of April 12, 2007, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 1 and 4-23, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 2 and 3 have been cancelled and new claim 23 added. Claims 1 and 4-23 remain in the application for consideration.

In response to the Examiner's objection to the claims, Applicant has amended claim 1 to eliminate the dash identified by the Examiner and multiple dependent claims 2 and 21. Applicant respectfully submits that this objection has now been overcome.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1-4, 14-16 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Roth '448. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as applied to claim 1 as amended and dependent claims 4-23.

The Examiner maintains that Roth discloses a rapid action coupling cylinder device having:

- (1) a pull in nipple (3);
- (2) conical beveled receptacle, i.e. element 11;
- (3) a cylinder (4)

- (4) an upper ball bearing cup 15, 26;
- (5) a lower spring 18, and
- (6) a housing 7.

However, the Examiner has identified no structure in Roth equivalent to the claimed pull in nipple (2) having a conical bevel (17) on a front face on a free end of the nipple as set out in claim 1.

In comparison, the Roth nipple has no free end, as its end is fixed to screw 4. Given this feature, there is no teaching in Roth of "an inner beveled circumference of the receiving aperture (102) on the cover (4) of the housing (11) engaging and guiding the pull-in nipple into conical receptacle (18) as claimed.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching in Roth of a pull-in nipple having a recessed conical receptacle (33) that engages an associated and oppositely beveled conical tip (3) in the housing as set out in independent claim 4.

In addition, the Examiner has not addressed numerous structural differences from Roth set out in the dependent claims. For example, there is no teaching of the lifting piston set out in claim 6, the blowing-air, openings or cooling agent set out in claim 8, the exchangeable wear insert of

claim 9, the turbine wheel of claim 10, the annular projection of claim 11, etc.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention patentably defines over Roth based on at least the structural differences set out above.

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By



Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197

Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528

G:\BN\R\rieb\Stark2\Pto\2007-07-12 Amendment.doc